



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/460,944 12/14/99 SITNIK

E PHA23.898

EXAMINER

TM02/0718

GREGORY L THORNE  
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD  
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

BUI, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED:

07/18/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/460,944

Applicant(s)

SITNIK, ERAN

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,823) in view of Talati et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,878).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Hwang discloses a television system comprising: a connection configured to be operatively coupled to a connection of an other television (Figs. 1a-1d); and a processor, i.e., a channel processor, configured to automatically provide query information to the other television (Figs. 1a-1d/item 1) and configured to automatically provide queried information in response to a query request from the other television, i.e., a user can order any requested on-demand services from any television and can interact with other televisions in the group (see col. 1/lines 55-65).

Hwang does not clearly identify exactly those requests as “query information” and providing “queried information in response to a query request from the other television” as argued by the Applicant; however, the technique of using “a query request” from a user to request for “query information” from another user, either those users uses televisions, smart phones or computers (Talati, col. 1/lines 13-23) is taught by Talati as Talati discloses a same technique as mentioned by using a query or group of information queries within the validation requests as the user wants to access to pay bills directly on-line to his or her service provider (see Talati, col. 3/lines 34-48; or col. 11/lines 17-65 for more details on the query databases and

responses therein). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hwang's television-to-television interactive system with Talati's teaching technique in using query information as means for communicating between televisions as long as there is a request for that queried information initiated by one of the interactive television users as desired.

As for claims 2-3 and 8, in view of claim 1 above, Hwang and Talati further discloses "wherein said connection is configured to provide said query and queried information to the other television", i.e., using the internal link among the workgroup (col. 5/lines 34-38) and "wherein said processor is configured to receive query compliance status information identifying the query compliance status of the other television" (Hwang, col. 17/lines 35-43; and Talati, col. 3/lines 34-48).

As for claims 4 and 9, Hwang and Talati further show wherein processor is configured to receive identifying information, i.e., a request from a user with identifying information (Hwang, Fig. 2 and col. 13/lines 19-32), from a user prior to enabling the user to do at least one of set and change query compliance status information (Hwang, col. 10/lines 6-9; and Talati, col. 3/lines 34-36 as a unique transaction identifier is included in the (validation) request).

As for claims 5 and 10, the step of "wherein said processor is configured to provide any queried information to the other television that does not violate the query compliance status of the other television" is suggested by Hwang as Hwang suggests that the command session can be terminated or interrupted if some query compliance status is violated or improperly done (Hwang, col. 14/lines 44-61) and also revealed by Talati as improper query response of the transaction can be interrupted by denying the service or access (Talati, col. 11/lines 16-26).

As for claims 6 and 11, Hwang further discloses "wherein the connection is one of an in-home network connection and an Internet connection", i.e., a groups of households connected to each

other for receiving interactive TV broadcasting signals and using LAN for accessing the Internet (remote office) as well (Figs. 8-10 and col. 13/lines 19-48).

Regarding claims 12-14 and 16-18, these method claims are rejected for the reasons given with respect to the system claims of 1-11 as already disclosed above.

As for claim 15, Hwang and Talati further suggests "wherein said identifying is performed by a mediator that is separate from each of said plurality of televisions", i.e., a control center which oversees the operation and is separated from each of the plurality of televisions (Hwang, Figs. 3a-3b) and Talati reveals including an admin 60 acts as a mediator between the originator 50 and recipient 55 (Talati, Fig. 3).

### *Conclusion*

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Levin et al. (US Patent 6,173,279) disclose a method of using a natural language interface to retrieve information from one or more data sources.

Porter et al (US Patent 5,864,682) disclose method and apparatus for frame accurate access of digital audio-visual information.

4. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-5399, (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").


*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park FF, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui  
Art Unit 2611  
July 03, 2001

  
ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600